

It will give President Obama a blank check to sign a really bad deal with the largest state sponsor of terror in the world. The mullahs will be allowed to enrich uranium and to continue to build their missile program.

It is unconscionable for Congress to grant such sweeping power to President Obama, allowing him to lift sanctions on Iran, no matter the cost to our national security, the security of Israel, and the entire world.

Even worse, the House is willing to do this today without having even one hearing, one amendment, a grand total of 40 minutes of debate about how we might actually reduce the risk to the world by constraining the President and the agreement he intends to sign. The House is giving this to the President without even trying. I can't be part of that.

We can't even use the excuse of timing. The President says we have until at least June 30 before any deal can be struck. On this immensely important issue, an issue that my colleagues tell me is one of the most important facing our Nation—and I certainly agree with that—we will give too short a shrift and move too quickly without doing all that we can.

For 35 years, since our Embassy in Tehran was taken over for 444 days by the Iranians, they have been killing Americans. They have killed my friends with IEDs in Iraq by the hundreds. Today, Shia militias run rampant through that country. They talk of Baghdad as an extension of the caliphate.

Even today, as I walked here, I watched on the news as the Iranians were firing on cargo ships off the coast of Yemen. They have tried to kill an Ambassador to the United States in this very town; yet we are about to strike an agreement that will grant them the capacity to build a nuclear weapon. This body is not doing all that it can.

I urge my fellow Members to oppose this bill and work toward a real solution that has the opportunity to keep Iran from getting that nuclear arsenal.

TPP—GET IT RIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement is the biggest trade deal our country has seen since NAFTA. With 12 participating countries, it encompasses 40 percent of the world's gross domestic product, so we have to get it right.

Working men and women in our communities are counting on us to get it right, not just fast, and that is why I oppose granting fast-track authority. You can see the impact of fast-tracked trade agreements in communities across the country, in the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs, factory jobs, middle class jobs, and lower wages for hard-working Americans.

In fact, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that since NAFTA, the U.S. has lost more than 700,000 jobs as production has moved to Mexico. The communities I represent in south central Wisconsin bear the scars of past trade agreements which have not lived up to what the supporters say for fast track.

Take Janesville, Wisconsin. Parker Pen has been in Janesville, Wisconsin, and employed at one time over 1,000 workers. Thanks to bad trade deals, in 2009, the remaining 150 jobs were shipped to Mexico. We are not just talking the last few years. We are talking the last few months.

In Darlington, Wisconsin, the Merkle-Korff Industries plant in Darlington, a town of 2,400 people, announced they are closing. Thirty-six family-supporting jobs are leaving that community. If that were proportional in Madison, Wisconsin, that would be like losing 3,600 jobs in a community that size.

Every time an American job is shipped out of the country, it pushes wages down for workers here.

Now, fast-track authority means that the American people, through their elected Representatives, will lose their voice in Congress by limiting the ability of Congress to debate and to amend the trade agreement.

Due to limited debate, because of the fast-track process, each Member would have a little over 2 minutes to debate that trade deal. Members would have no opportunity to offer amendments on an agreement that has 29 chapters, that covers everything from food safety to environmental standards, labor rights, intellectual property, and more.

It would give Congress' constitutional authority to the President for 6 years. That means this President, the next President, and potentially, the next President; and all Congress would be left with is a yes-or-no vote.

Before Congress grants fast-track authority, we need to get the Trans-Pacific Partnership right. What does it mean to get it right? Well, one, it means having strong enforcement language to protect American workers and our environment, which we don't currently have in the current deal.

On several occasions, I have reviewed the labor and environmental chapters of the law. While, in some instances, the language is marginally better, it still lacks enforcement.

With the Colombia free trade agreement, we can see exactly what happened. While language has been implemented in the law to protect labor rights, there has been absolutely no implementation of that language. In fact, in the 4 years since the Colombia free trade agreement has passed, 105 union organizers have been killed—murdered—in that country. The environmental chapter, I would argue, is arguably worse and still lacks the same enforcement capacity to protect our country.

Getting TPP means scrapping the investor state dispute settlement provi-

sions that put corporate interests ahead of American sovereignty.

The ISDS provisions are unique. They create a tribunal run by the same corporate trade lawyers who, on Monday, represent the multinational corporations; on Tuesday, are supposed to be the fair arbitrators of the law; and on Wednesday, are back on the corporate payroll.

These provisions are only for multinational corporations and not for American small businesses or labor or environmental violations.

Getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership right means having other important provisions included, like currency manipulation, protections against human trafficking, and protections for human rights for LGBT individuals and for single mothers in countries that have implemented sharia law.

Getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership right means having open and transparent negotiations because there is still too much the American people don't know about this secretive agreement. After all, only about 600 people have been involved in drafting this agreement, largely corporate CEOs, but not you and not me.

The bottom line is that this will cost jobs and wages. Another bad trade deal will cost more American jobs and lower our wages.

We have seen how free trade agreements like NAFTA, CAFTA, and the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement passed using the same fast-track process have turned out to be a bad deal for American workers.

We need to get this right, not just fast. Congress must say "no" to the fast-track process.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to highlight and address, hopefully, an issue that needs to be held in check here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, our office has been contacted numerous times from individuals across the Nation about attacks on private property rights by Big Government. Big Government continues to increasingly address and impact private property rights day in and day out.

We have heard stories of family farmers, people like Neil Vitale in my district, in western New York, who has been farming his land on the Pennsylvania border for years and years and years. Just yesterday, our Governor in the great State of New York banned the development of natural gas by banning hydraulic fracturing across the State of New York.

How does that impact Mr. Vitale? Mr. Vitale was going to use the resources of the property rights represented in the natural gas mineral rights to the farm that he has taken

care of for so many years in order to take care of the bills for him, his family, and his family farm, but now, that right has been lost because government action has taken that right away from Mr. Vitale.

There is Bob Brace in Pennsylvania, who was ordered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the EPA to stop farming 30 acres of his land as they were determining it to be a wetland.

Mr. Brace has been farming that land for years. He had to go through court. He went to the U.S. district court, and they said he is okay. He can keep farming the land.

That wasn't enough for Big Government. They took it up to the court of appeals, and ultimately, the court ordered that Mr. Brace had to stop farming that 30 acres and pay a \$10,000 fine and also hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to restore that property to the property that he has been using in his family for generations. When Mr. Brace tried to go to court to seek compensation for that right that was taken away, the court said: No, you don't have a right here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is against my fundamental belief in this country of private property rights and freedom. In the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, it says that the government can act and it can take action, but it must provide just compensation when it impacts people's private property.

That is why here in Washington, D.C., I have taken two concrete actions to address this issue, Mr. Speaker. Recently, I started the Private Property Rights Caucus with my colleagues in Congress. This is a caucus that has been made up of 14 original members, spanning from Maine to California, to highlight this issue and to say to Big Government, enough is enough.

I choose to stand with the individuals and the fundamental property rights that they have paid for, they have earned, that they take care of in maintaining their property, paying taxes on their property, and living the American Dream.

I also introduced the Defense of Property Rights Act. The Defense of Property Rights Act is based on just a simple reading of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. It says just that, if you take action as Big Government has done, Big Government will have to take into consideration the impact on private property rights.

If private property rights are taken, we clarify the ability of individuals to go and follow the Constitution and at least get compensation from the government for taking those private property rights away from these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, these are commonsense, simple principles that I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can join with me and say that is only fair because, if you really care about our fellow Americans, when their property

rights are taken away because of Big Government action, we should at least say to them: we will stand with you as individuals and as Americans who believe in the fundamental principles of freedom and of private property rights, and we will at least get you some sort of compensation for the injury that you have suffered.

As a result of that, I urge my colleagues to join the caucus, support the Defense of Property Rights Act, and join me in highlighting this issue so that we can say enough is enough.

It is time to stand with our individuals, the constituents that we represent here in Washington, D.C., rather than the interests of Big Government and Big Government on all levels, Federal, State, and local.

RECOGNIZING FRANK E. LEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Frank E. Lee who, after 35 years as the familiar afternoon personality at WXRT, Frank welcomed his much-deserved retirement last week.

As the afternoon voice of WXRT, he is a Chicago institution unto himself. Frank's boss, Norm Winer, put it best when he said: "Frank's wide-ranging love and knowledge of music, his remarkable verbal skills, his wry and sardonic sense of humor, impressive sense of professionalism, and generous nature have distinguished him among Chicago's all-time great air personalities."

I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Frank E. Lee for his career as one of Chicago's finest radio personalities and most recognizable voices. We thank him for his years of service on the air.

I was there in the studio as he closed off his career with the Stones' classic, "Moonlight Mile." We tried to capture the essence of how Chicagoans felt when he left. All I can say is I got silence on my radio.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAHAFFEY THEATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an institution that, for 50 years, has been the cultural heart of the city of St. Petersburg, Florida.

This month, in May, the Mahaffey Theater celebrates its 50th anniversary. Opening in 1965, the venue was originally called the Bayfront Center Complex, a combination arena and theater along the city's most beautiful downtown waterfront.

It quickly proved to be a gathering place for community and civic groups, and its many shows drew tourists from around the State. The artists that have

performed at the Mahaffey could easily fill an entertainment hall of fame, from Louis Armstrong to Dionne Warwick to Liza Minelli to Johnny Mathis, Kenny Rogers, and even "The President's Own" United States Marine Band, an event that was secured by the invitation of my predecessor, Congressman Bill Young.

The first significant makeover for the venue occurred in 1987, and the Bayfront Theater became the Mahaffey Theater after a generous gift from St. Petersburg's Mahaffey family. In 2011, Big3 Entertainment took over the management of the Mahaffey, with CEO and chairman Bill Edwards privately funding a number of major enhancements.

Today, the Mahaffey is home to the Florida Orchestra, and it is the annual host site for the Miss Florida Pageant.

The Mahaffey also supports, very importantly, the highly successful Class Acts program, which enables school children to experience the performing arts through in-theater performances, as well as in-school outreach and extension programs.

□ 1030

The theater also has been the site of very important moments of American history. The theater was the site of the 1996 Vice Presidential debate between Al Gore and Jack Kemp. And in 2007, the Mahaffey hosted the nationally televised Republican Presidential primary debate, known as the very first YouTube debate, having Americans, for the very first time, submit questions via YouTube video clips.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Mahaffey Theater, celebrating a venue that today anchors a growing and thriving Pinellas County arts community and serves as a stage that celebrates the arts but, most importantly, celebrates the remarkable human spirit, the creativity of so many performers, and the dedication and commitment of the greater St. Petersburg community.

FREE AMERICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House of Representatives again to introduce and talk to this body and to the American people about my constituent, Amir Hekmati. Amir is an American. He is a United States marine. He is a brother. He is a son. He is a Michigander. He grew up in my hometown of Flint, Michigan. He served this country in uniform, as I said, in the United States Marine Corps. He is of Iranian descent, though he was born in the United States.

In 2011, for the first time, he traveled to Iran to visit family he had never met, a grandmother he had never seen. He traveled under his own name, notified the Iranian Government that he